

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1		
2		
3	1. DEFENDANTS' RULE 12 MOTIONS HAVE NOT YET BEEN ADJUDICATED ON	
4	THE MERITS .....	2
5	2. TAITZ HAS SATISFIED HER BURDEN OF ESTABLISHING THAT THE	
6	CONDUCT COMPLAINED OF IS "PROTECTED ACTIVITY" .....	3
7	a. The Categories of Misconduct Complained of Against Taitz .....	4
8	b. Each of the Acts Complained of In Numbers 2, 5, 6, 7, and 9 Are in Connection With a Public Issue	
9	Because They Relate to Written and Oral Statements Made Before Administrative/Judicial Proceedings Before	
10	Executive and Judicial Bodies and/or Are Pre-Litigation Statements.....	6
11	c. Each of the Remaining Acts Complained of Are in Connection With a Public Issue Because They Relate to	
12	Political/Fundraising Activity .....	7
13	3. PLAINTIFFS HAVE PRESENTED NO COMPETENT EVIDENCE	
14	DEMONSTRATING THEIR PROBABILITY OF PREVAILING ON THE CLAIMS	
15	PRESENTED .....	10
16	a. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Make a Prima Facie Case, Based on Competent, Admissible Evidence, for Their	
17	Claim for Disclosure of Private Information .....	11
18	b. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Make a Prima Facie Case, Based on Competent, Admissible Evidence, for	
19	Their Claim for Defamation Per Se.....	12
20	c. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Make a Prima Facie Case, Based on Competent, Admissible Evidence, for Their	
21	Claim for False Light - Invasion of Privacy .....	13
22	d. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Make a Prima Facie Case, Based on Competent, Admissible Evidence, for	
23	Their Claim for Harassment .....	14
24	e. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Make a Prima Facie Case, Based on Competent, Admissible Evidence, for Their	
25	Claim for False Designations and Descriptions of Facts.....	14
26	f. Plaintiffs Cannot Make a Prima Facie Case, Based on Competent, Admissible Evidence, for Their Claim	
27	for Injunction Because That is Not a "Stand-Alone" Cause of Action in California .....	15
28	4. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT TAITZ'S RULE 12(B)(6) MOTION.....	15
	5. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT TAITZ' RULE 12(B)(1) MOTION .....	15
	6. CONCLUSION .....	16

# **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

## Cases

1		
2		
3		
4		
5	<i>Aisenson v. American Broad. Co.</i> (1990) 220 Cal.App.3d 146, 161, 269 Cal.Rptr. 379 ....	13
6	<i>Bank One, Texas, N.A. v. Montle</i> (1st Cir. 1992) 964 F.2d 48, 49.....	16
7	<i>Bechtel v. Liberty Nat'l Bank</i> (9th Cir. 1976) 534 F.2d 1335, 1341, fn. 8.....	2
8	<i>Bergman v. Drum</i> (2005) 29 Cal.App.4th 11, 18.....	10
9	<i>Briggs v. Eden Council for Hope &amp; Opportunity</i> (1999) 19 Cal.4th 1106, 1113, 81 Cal.Rptr.2d 471 .....	4
10	<i>Chavez v. Mendoza</i> (2001) 94 Cal.App.4th 1083, 1087, 114 Cal.Rptr.2d 825 .....	3
11	<i>CKE Restaurants, Inc. v. Moore</i> (2008) 159 Cal.App.4th 262, 271, 70 Cal.Rptr.3d 921, 928.....	6
12	<i>Cornerstone v. Davies</i> (1952) 38 Cal.2d 315, 322, 239 P.2d 876 .....	11
13	<i>Crowley v. Katleman</i> (1994) 8 Cal.4th 666, 681, 34 Cal.Rptr.2d 386.....	15
14	<i>D.C. v. R.R.</i> (2010) 182 Cal.App.4th 1190, 106 Cal.Rptr.3d 399.....	8
15	<i>Damon v. Ocean Hills Journalism Club</i> (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 468, 479, 102 Cal.Rptr.2d 205, 212.....	7
17	<i>Du Charme v. International Broth. of Elec. Workers, Local 45</i> (2003) 110 Cal.App.4th 107, 119, 1 Cal.Rptr.3d 501 .....	8
18	<i>Fellows v. National Enquirer, Inc.</i> (1986) 42 Cal.3d 234, 238, 228 Cal.Rptr. 215.....	13
19	<i>Fellows v. National Enquirer, Inc.</i> (1986) 42 Cal.3d 234, 242, 228 Cal.Rptr. 215.....	14
20	<i>Forsher v. Bugliosi</i> (1980) 26 Cal.3d 792, 808-809, 163 Cal.Rptr. 628 .....	12
21	<i>Hill v. NCAA</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 1, 26, 26 Cal.Rptr.2d 834.....	12
22	<i>Kurwa v. Harrington, Foxx, Dubrow &amp; Canter, LLP</i> (2007) 146 Cal.App.4th 841, 846, 53 Cal.Rptr.3d 256, 260 .....	7
24	<i>Lewis v. Lewis</i> (9th Cir. 1966) 358 F.2d 495, 502 .....	16
25	<i>M.G. v. Time Warner, Inc.</i> (2001) 89 Cal.App.4 <sup>th</sup> 623, 629, 107 Cal.Rptr.2d 504 .....	3
26	<i>McGarry v. University of San Diego</i> (2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 97, 108 .....	10
27	<i>Navellier v. Sletten</i> (2002) 29 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 82, 88-89, 124 Cal.Rptr. 530.....	3
28	<i>Neville v. Chudacoff</i> (2008) 160 Cal.App.4th 1255, 1262-1263, 73 CR3d 383, 388-389 ...	7



1	<i>Neville v. Chudacoff</i> (2008) 160 Cal.App.4th at 1266, 73 Cal.Rptr.3d at 391, fn. 8.....	6
2	<i>Saadeh v. Farouki</i> (DC Cir. 1997) 107 F.3d 52, 56–57.....	16
3	<i>Shell Oil Co. v. Richter</i> (1942) 52 Cal.App.2d 164, 168, 125 P.2d 930.....	15
4	<i>Shulman v. Group W Productions, Inc.</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4 <sup>th</sup> 200, 214, 74 Cal.Rptr.2d 843 ...	11
5	<i>Sipple v. Chronicle Publ'g Co.</i> (1984) 154 Cal.App.3d 1040, 1047, 201 Cal.Rptr. 665 ....	12
6	<i>Sipple v. Foundation for Nat'l Progress</i> (1999) 71 Cal.App.4th 226, 236–240, 83 Cal.Rptr.2d 677 .....	8
7		
8	<i>Taus v. Loftus</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4th 683, 714.....	10
9		
	<u>Statutes</u>	
10	18 U.S.C. 875(d) .....	14
11	425.16(e)(2).....	7
12	47 U.S.C. 223(a).....	14
13	California Civil Code §45 .....	12
14	California Code of Civil Procedure §425.16.....	3, 6
15	California Code of Civil Procedure §425.16(b)(1) .....	10
16	California Code of Civil Procedure § 425.16(e)(3) .....	7
17	California Code of Civil Procedure § 425.16(e)(4) .....	7
18	California Penal Code section 115(a) .....	13, 15
19	California Penal Code section 472 .....	13, 15
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		